

Attorney Docket No.: 42.P12313

Application No.: 10/038,917

Page 9

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 remain pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 7; rejected claims 1-4, 11, 12, 15, 16, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2; rejected claims 1-3, 14, 15, 19-21, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,168) in view of Ramberg et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No.2002/0000464); rejected claims 4, 11, 13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langer et al. in view of Ramberg et al. and further in view of Goldbold et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,733,391); rejected claims 5, 22, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langer et al. in view of Ramberg et al. and further in view of Good et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,095); rejected claims 6 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langer et al. in view of Ramberg et al. and further in view of Hoffmann (U.S. Patent No. 6,879,583); rejected claims 7 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langer et al. in view of Ramberg et al. and further in view of Hoffmann and Blanc et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,251); rejected claims 10, 18, 23, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langer et al. in view of Ramberg et al. and further in view of Sexton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,763); rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langer et al. in view of Ramberg et al. and further in view of Goldbold et al. and Humpleman (U.S. Patent No. 6,603,488); rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langer et al. in view of Ramberg et al. and further in view of Mashinsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,912,277); and stated that claims 8 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The objection to claim 7 and the 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 rejections have been obviated by the above amendments to claims 1-4, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, 20, and 21 .

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-4, 11, 13-16, 19-21, and 25 over Langer et al. in view of Ramberg et al., with or without Goldbold et al. Claim 1, as amended, requires a method including, *inter alia*, "if the data structure of the packet matches the data structure for the known property management device determining the property management device coupled to the communications port to be a known property management

Attorney Docket No.: 42.P12313

Application No.: 10/038,917

Page 10

device.” Claim 11, as amended, requires a method including, *inter alia*, “if the data structure of the packet matches that for a known property management device determining a device coupled to the communications port to be the matching known property management device.” Claim 14, as amended, requires a medium including, *inter alia*, “if the data structure of the packet matches that for the known property management device determining the property management device coupled to the communications port to be a known property management device.” Claim 19, as amended, requires an apparatus including, *inter alia*, “means for determining the device coupled to the communications port to be a known property management device if the data structure of the packet matches that for the known property management device.” Claim 25, as amended, requires a system including, *inter alia*, “a processor . . . to determine that the property management device coupled to the communications port is a known property management device if the data structure of the received packet matches the data structure for the known property management device.” The combination of Langer et al. and Ramberg et al., with or without Goldbold et al., fails to teach or suggest all elements of the methods, medium, apparatus, and system set forth in amended claims 1, 11, 14, 19, and 25.

None of Langer et al., Ramberg et al., or Goldbold et al. teaches or suggests comparing a data structure of a received packet with a data structure for a known “property management device” or determining a device to be a known “property management device” as set forth in the independent claims. The general telephony devices in the applied references do not teach or suggest the claimed “property management device[s].”

Because the references as combined fail to teach or suggest all elements of claims 1, 11, 14, 19, and 25, as amended, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established, and the § 103(a) rejection over Langer et al. and Ramberg et al., with or without Goldbold et al., should be withdrawn. Claims 2-4, 13, 15, 16, 20, and 21 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on claims 1, 11, 14, 19, and 25.

Regarding claims 5-7, 10, 12, 17, 18, 22-24, and 26-28, the proposed addition of Good et al. (claims 5, 22, and 26), Hoffmann (claims 6 and 17), Blanc et al. (claims 7 and 27), Sexton et al. (claim 10, 18, 23, and 28), Humpleman (claim 12), and/or Sexton et al. (claim 24), even if

*Attorney Docket No.: 42.P12313**Application No.: 10/038,917**Page 11*

such were proper, fails to cure the deficiencies of Langer et al. and Ramberg et al., and Goldbold et al. noted above. That is, these additional references also fail to teach or suggest a data structure for known "property management device[s]" as set forth in the amended claims. In view of the above, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established for claims 5-7, 10, 12, 17, 18, 22-24, and 26-28, and the § 103(a) rejections thereof should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-28 are respectfully requested.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Alan Pedersen-Giles, attorney for Applicant, at the number below to discuss such matters.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0221 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 23, 2006



Alan Pedersen-Giles
Registration No. 39,996

c/o Intel Americas
LF3
4030 Lafayette Center Drive
Chantilly, VA 20151
(703) 633-1061